Bibliothèque Nationale du Québec

THIRD EDITION.

THE ERRORS

OF

THE PLYMOUTH BRETHREN

BY

THE VERY REV. JAMES CARMICHAEL, M.A., D.C.L.

DEAN OF MONTREAL.

Price 5 Cents.

Montreal:

W. DRYSDALE & CO.,

BOOKSELLERS AND STATIONERS,

1888.

THE

TH

THIRD EDITION.

THE ERRORS

OF

THE PLYMOUTH BRETHREN

BY

THE VERY REV. JAMES CARMICHAEL, M.A., D.C.L.

DEAN OF MONTREAL.

BIBLIOTECA SANCTI PII

Price 5 Cents.

Montreal:

W. DRYSDALE & CO.,

BOOKSELLERS AND STATIONERS,

1888.

At the request of many, I have revised this Tract, first published in 1869. I have added a few closing pages, as during the intermediate years, I have found the "List of Questions" set forth in them pre-eminently useful.

JAS. CARMICHAEL.

ST. GEORGE'S RECTORY,
MONTREAL, 1888.

BX
8800
C37
1888

B.Q.R.
NO. 4980

THE ERRORS
OF
THE PLYMOUTH BRETHREN

THE object of this Tract is that of bringing before its readers, in a concise form, what I believe to be the errors of the Plymouth Brethren or Brethren. The Tract has a threefold division, and undertakes to show: First.—What the Brethren think of the Church and Christian bodies generally. Secondly.—What dangerous views they hold and teach in connection with the Old Testament. Thirdly.—What dangerous views they hold and teach in connection with the New Testament.

I.

First.—What do the Brethren think of the Church? The following quotation, taken from a tract written by a well-known female member, will give the reply. I have chosen to quote from this tract rather than from one by the late Mr. Darby, because this lady is a much plainer writer in every way than the founder of the body. Speaking of the views of the Brethren, she says: "*Believing that the Church of Christ is and can be but one body, the*

53094

habitation of God through the Spirit, they deem that it ought to appear one body in its visible manifestation on earth—one body in which all believers in the Lord Jesus are baptized by one Spirit." (a) In other words, that the visible church on earth should be composed solely and alone of converted people, and that consequently "*a national church errs on the one hand, and all sectarian denominations on the other." (b)*

Now, the answer to this is scripturally plain and decisive. If Christ wished such a church to exist, why did He utter the parable of the tares and the wheat, or the net cast into the sea? I know that the Brethren deny that these parables have anything to say to the church, but I am sure that an unprejudiced reader will admit that they refer to the kingdom of God on earth, and that that kingdom is identical with the church. To understand these two parables, the question to settle is, what did the Lord Jesus mean by the expression "kingdom" so often used throughout them. That he did not mean his millennial kingdom is obvious, for the glory of that kingdom will be the absence of tares; and that he did not mean the grace of God in an individual's heart (Rom. xiv., 17) is equally plain, for our whole life should be spent in pulling up the tares there. We are, therefore, shut up to the conclusion that the kingdom referred to was the church, and for the simple reason that the

---

(*a*) "Who are the Plymouth Brethren?" By Mrs. H. Grattan Guinness, page 13.

(*b*) Do. do., page 14.

kingdom of Christ is represented in the Bible as being identical with the church. Baptism is the seal of admission into the church, and baptism is the seal of admission into the kingdom (John iii. 5.) The church has power to bind, loose, remit and retain, and the kingdom has the same power. (Mat. xvi., 18-19.) The church is the guardian of the gospel; so, also, is the kingdom (Matt. xiii., 19.) In short, the kingdom is the church, and the church the kingdom. Now, if this be the case (and I think it would be very hard to prove it is not), it must be plain to all that the Lord Jesus Christ never countenanced this idea of a church composed solely of believers. · The tares were to be left with the wheat till the harvest, the fish were not to be selected till brought to land, and as the harvest is the end of the world, this work of severing will be in the judgment of a present personal Saviour, through his ministering servants, the angels of heaven.

But, not only is the idea opposed to Scripture, but the Brethren have failed to carry it out. "*The wear and tear of reality has put their ideal of a church to the test, and it has fairly gone to pieces.*" (*a*) Once it was a compact body, composed solely of professed believers, without a break in its ranks. Now, its ranks are broken: its body of believers split up into antagonistic parties, refusing to commune the one with the other. Indeed, as far as the Darby and Newton divisions are concerned, it is the old story of the "Jews having no dealings with the Samaritans."

(*a*) Letter on Recognition of Pastors, by H. Grattan Guinness.

The history of the Brethren to the present has been "war to the knife" between the elected Saints of God.

Holding such views on the general subject of the church, it is only natural to suppose that the views of the Brethren, with reference to all Christian bodies, would not be of a very liberal nature, and we are, therefore, not surprised to learn "*that the established Church of England is an apostacy*(*a*), *that it has no just claim to be considered a church of God* (*b*), *and that Dissenters have marshalled themselves in the ranks of the Infidel and the Socinian, and are grasping at all the power and privilege that the world can give them.*" (*c*) These are very plain words, one would hope that some of the gentler minds among the Brethren would shrink back from endorsing them. But here they are in black and white, and no doubt, I think, can remain as to what the leading minds of this body believe us to be. It matters little that for long and many a year you may have enjoyed true spiritual life in the Church of England, the higher your spiritual blessings the greater your apostacy. It matters little either how others may have lived happily in other churches, at best they are but "*props of Infidelity*" "*and supports of Socinianism.*" Hence arises the call "to come out" from all christian denominations. Hence the solemn warnings against all ministers and pastors. Hence the narrow-mindedness, so unlike Christ, and so detrimental

---

(*a*) Separation from Apostacy, page 27.

(*b*) The Church of the Scriptures, page 1.

(*c*) Present Prospects, page 10.

to that spirit of love which is one secret of the church's existence. Yes, I am not afraid to say it, that he who joins this body runs the danger of being forced to set his hand against every man. His sphere of christian usefulness is contracted, and the genial, kind and generous spirit of Christianity for him is undermined. The church (the body of Christ) to him, in a village, town, or city, is composed of the select few who have joined the Brethren, and have come out from all sects. His conversion is likely to develop a haughty dogmatical spirit in conversation,—a breaking up often of the fondest and dearest associations of the past, and an undisguised attempt to put anyone down that dares to differ with him. In short, he is light, and all of us are in various degrees of spiritual darkness.

Now, I yield to no one in my devoted love for the Church of England. I believe that in doctrine she is divine, and in organization apostolic, but I would be very sorry, indeed, to say that no converted man could live a long and noble life to Christ outside of her pale; and I am perfectly sure that Christians not belonging to the Church of England would be equally sorry to say such a thing of their respective denominations. But these new preachers practically say this. They may strive to evade the accusation by replying "that there are many Christians among us, but that they ought to come out;" but this reply proves the accusation to be correct. If in the eyes of these preachers, the test of a man being a Christian in communion with the Church of England *is* his leaving the Church of England, it is plain

they believe that no real Christian can *remain* a member of that church: and this, to my knowledge, is the result of their teaching. He who joins the Brethren joins the narrowest and bitterest sect that exists to-day.

II.

I will now direct your attention to the dangerous views the Brethren hold and teach in connection with the Old Testament. And, first, I would notice their views on the Moral law. In a well known tract, entitled "A Scriptural Enquiry into the Law," &c., this subject is gone into at length, and the views of the Brethren are summed up in the following words: "*The law is not the rule of the believer's life.*" Now, no one is more willing to admit than I am that righteousness by law can never save me. I agree with the Brethren that the "law of love" is, and ever ought to be, the secret of the fulfilment of all Christian duties; but I can in no way see that the law of love must of necessity exist apart from that law which is God's moral standard for all his people. The terrors of the law for me are buried in Christ, the wise statutes of the law remain behind for me to strive to obey through love, and therefore to tell me that the law is not my rule of life, is little short of disconnecting morality from religion.

But such a view is not only opposed to the interests of morality; it is opposed to the voice of Scripture. These preachers may tell you that the freedom of the gospel demands a rejection of the law. They may take

these words, written by the finger of God, and fling them from them as unworthy of their advancement in religion. But I call on you to cling to Christ and his Apostles on this question. "Think not," says Christ, "that I am "come to destroy the law and the prophets. I am not "come to destroy, but to fulfil. Whosoever shall break "these commandments, and teach men so, he shall be "least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do "and teach them shall be great in the kingdom of heaven." Do not forget that St. Paul said: "I delight in the law "of God after the inward man." Do not forget when men tell you that there is nothing naturally holy as a rule of life for the Christian in the law, that the same apostle said: "Wherefore the law is holy, and the command- "ment holy, just and good." And above all, when men tell you that the gospel made void the law, and did away with its necessity, do not forget these words: "Do we "then make void the law? God forbid. Nay, we "establish the law."

It is with a shudder that we should listen to the fact —startlingly new to us, horribly opposed to all our ideas of God's justice—to say nothing of his love, and yet asserted with no little dogmatism by this body—namely, that the Church of God does not appear in the Old Testament Scriptures at all, and that such men as Abraham never did nor ever will belong to it. In a controversy between Mr. Grant and myself on the subject of the Church, Mr. Grant states "*that the Church was not in existence, nor could be, till the death of Christ, and that in the Church Abraham has no part, nor could any*

saint have till the Holy Ghost came after the ascension of Christ." (a)

Now, first, let me show you the utter folly of the statement that the Church of God, "the Ecclesia," does not appear in the Old Testament scriptures at all. On this question we naturally appeal to Jewish History; but we are told very ingeniously and dogmatically that we cannot produce a text in the Old Testament in which the Jewish System is called "the Church" in the same sense that the word is used by St. Paul. Now, I can produce at least twenty-three texts where the word is used,—not, indeed, in our translation, but in the original text. Mr. Darby, the founder of this sect, was very fond of quoting from the Septuagint or Greek translation of the Scriptures, and in the Septuagint, wherever the word "congregation" or "assembly" occurs, you may fairly translate it "Church." For instance, when Joshua read the law before the "congregation," or Moses spoke in the ears of the "congregation," Joshua read and Moses spoke before "the Church." Indeed, if I counted how often the word "Ecclesia" is used in the Old Testament, and then pursued the same course with the New, I am fully persuaded that I would find that for once it is used in the "New Testament, it is used twice in the Old." So much for that error.

But there is something revolting in the error which arises out of this assertion. A more monstrous idea I never heard broached, than that men like Abraham and

(a) "The Kingdom and the Church," page 9.

Samuel, did not, do not, or will not belong, to the Church or body of Christ. Again, I ask you to cling to Christ and his Apostles on this subject. Foremost amongst the examples of saving faith held out to us as Christians, stands this very Abraham. However the Brethren may strive to degrade him, the voice of the greatest apostle ever inspired by God has sealed his *perfect*, his *undoubted* salvation and heavenly glory in these words: "These "all—(Abel, Enoch, Abraham, Isaac, and others)—these "all died in faith, not having received the promises, but "having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them "and embraced them, for they desired a better country— "that is a heavenly; wherefore God is not ashamed to "be called their God, for He hath prepared for them a "city." Now, if Abraham died in faith, if he was persuaded of God's promises, if, in the strong language of the apostle, he embraced them, if his longing, ardent desire was after a heavenly home, and if that God was not ashamed to be called his God, is it not a monstrous assertion that he should be in a less close position to Christ hereafter than I: or any Christian who lived after the Pentecostal effusion? Nay, is it not in direct opposition to the Scriptures; "Know ye not," says the apostle (in the third of Galatians), "that they which "are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham, for "the Scriptures foreseeing that God would justify the "heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto "Abraham, saying that in Thee shall all nations be "blessed; so they which be of faith are blessed with "faithful Abraham." Can words be stronger? The

same gospel that saves me was preached by God to Abraham, and he believed it, as I believe it; and if I, as a faithful man, am to be blessed at all, it is not away from Abraham, but with him, "for they which be of faith are blessed WITH faithful Abraham."

III.

Let me now notice the dangerous views the Brethren hold in connection with the New Testament. And I would first call your attention to that view which limits the work of Jesus Christ as a Saviour altogether to the few hours he lay extended on the cross. The following words expressive of this idea are brought out very clearly in a Plymouth periodical entitled, "Things New and Old." "*We believe*" (says the writer) "*that Christ's sufferings for sin, his sufferings as the sinner's substitute, were exclusively confined to the cross.*" *(a)* The same idea is elaborated in these words taken from Mr. Macintosh's revised notes on Leviticus, page 58 and 59. He is commenting on these words: "Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses." This, he writes "*was "entirely sympathetic, the power of fellow feeling which in "him was perfect. There is therefore a manifest difference "between Christ suffering as a voluntary sympathizer with "human misery, and his suffering as the sinner's substitute.*"

According to this teaching the Lord Jesus Christ was little more than a loving, gentle teacher, who felt, and that deeply, for the sins and sorrows of his fellow

---

(*a*) Quotation taken from tract "Test before you Trust," page 4.

creatures, felt as you might feel when the drunkard crosses your path, or when entering the homes of the poor, you witness their struggle for life, and the many hardships they are forced to endure. He was not yet the sinner's substitute when he said to the outcast—"Neither do I condemn thee." He was not yet the sinner's substitute when in the garden of Gethsemane he wept, and prayed, and suffered, and angels came to comfort him. Nay, it was but the sympathy of the saint, not the work of the substitute; *that* was confined to the cross.

I meet this view at once with Scripture. Surely nothing can be plainer than that Christ suffered for us as much in life as in death. St. Peter tells us (1 Ep. ii., 24,) that "Christ in himself bare our sins in his own body *up to the* tree." (*a*) St. Peter tells us, Heb. iv., 15. "That he was tempted in all points as we are, yet without sin," and nothing but the wildest infatuation or the most determined desire *not* to believe Scripture can evade the force of these well-known words, "Surely he hath *borne* "our griefs and *carried* our sorrows. He was wounded "for our transgressions. He was bruised for our "iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, "and by his stripes we are healed." Here through life he is represented as bearing and carrying our sorrows, and the bruising, the chastisement of Herod and Pilate previous to his crucifixion, are described as a portion of that healing which alone can make us acceptable to God.

(*a*) See Margin Bible.

Why the Brethren hold such a view, arises from another error which I would now speak of, namely—their denial of the doctrine of the Imputed Righteousness of Christ. In a well-known Plymouth tract by Mr. Stanley, entitled, "Imputed Righteousness," he states: "*The thought of Christ having kept the law for me, and* "*that it is imputed to me for righteousness, would be* "*utterly wrong, for this would only be making me righteous* "*on the principle of law keeping, which God says is* "*impossible.*" (page 6.)

With reference to this quotation, I would only say, and that with sorrow, that such a statement is a mere trick, or trap of words. God says very distinctly that I cannot be made holy through keeping the law for myself, but he never said that I could not be made holy through Christ keeping it for me. So far from doing so he tells me "that Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to *every one* that believeth," (Rom. x., 4,) and again, "for as by one man's (Adam's) disobedience, many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one (Jesus Christ), shall many be made righteous, (Rom. v., 19). Here Adam's disobedience to the law is represented as made up by Christ's obedience to it.

As to what the Brethren believe on the subject of a Christian's righteousness, it is very hard for an outsider to settle, as they are so undecided themselves. All agree that whatever righteousness we possess it is not Christ's righteousness through law keeping, but beyond this their views on the subject are so chaotic and contradictory that every man's hand is against his brother. Out of these

many views, that held by Mr. Bell is to my mind the most painfully striking. It is to be found on the 15th page of a tract, entitled, "Cease ye from man." In commenting on the third chapter of the Epistle to the Romans he says, "*The righteousness spoken of here is evidently the righteousness of the Godhead, that essential attribute.*" Now, there can be but one meaning given to these words, namely, that the Christian is made holy in God's eyes, by being made in some respects as God. In the commonly received doctrine of the imputed righteousness of Christ the righteousness of the man Christ is put to the account of men. "Nay," Mr. Bell teaches, "*it is not the righteousness of the man Christ, but the righteousness of the Godhead.*" I can never read these words without naturally thinking of Satan's words to our first parents, "Ye shall be as gods."

The next dangerous view held by the Brethren worthy of notice is that with reference to repentance. In a tract by Mr. Macintosh, entitled "Repentance unto life, what is it?" after stating that the general definition of repentance is "*a hearty sorrow for sin, and a sincere "desire to forsake the same" (a)* he says of that definition always received by the Christian Church, "*That a "more fearfully mutilated, marred, or depressing gospel "could not be conceived.*" (*b*) He then states with no little recklessness, "*that sorrow for sin can never be "produced by looking at sin or its consequences;*" (*c*)

(*a*) Page 1.
(*b*) Page 4.
(*c*) Page 5.

"that the way to get pardon, is not by renouncing sin, "or being sorry for it, or forsaking it, but by receiving "the stupendous truth that sin is put away." (*a*)

Now here again there is a trick of words. Every evangelical Christian knows that no man gets pardon on account of renouncing sin, but yet the renunciation of sin is as necessary a part of man's action in connection with pardon, as the reception of the stupendous truth that sin is put away. When the Brethren preach, however, they practically carry out Mr. Macintosh's theory. They call on all sinners on the spur of the moment to stand up and declare their perfect conversion. A man may be aroused to a knowledge of sin by their words, but if he does not cast away from him all lingering sorrow for his sin, he is told that he is a lost or ruined soul; or if in humility he says, "I hope I am saved," he is consigned to the same fate. (*b*) Now, it was not thus the Apostles preached, although they lived in an age of miracles, when the Holy Ghost was poured out publicly, and with a special power. St. Peter made the distinction between repentance and conversion in the most marked manner, when he spoke to the Jews in Solomon's porch. (Acts 3.) He accused them of murdering Christ and killing the Prince of Life, and he closed with these words: "Repent ye, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." Surely the sense of the Apostle is plain enough. They were to repent

---

(*a*) Page 7.

(*b*) A fact capable of proof.

of the sin of murdering Christ and to acknowledge him as their Saviour, but the repentance was to precede the acknowledgment.

Again, take the case of Simon, who offered Peter money, in order that he might buy divine powers. (*a*) That the man had never been thoroughly converted to God is plain, for St. Peter told him he was "in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity." But how did St. Peter treat him? He did not then preach Christ to him, but he used these words: "Repent, therefore, of this thy "wickedness, and pray God if perhaps the thought of "thine heart may be forgiven thee." Will Mr. Macintosh tell us that St. Peter "mutilated, marred, and depressed" the Gospel when he gave the wretched Simon this advice? or that St. John did so (1 John, i., 9) when he wrote, "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to "forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unright-"eousness," or that the wise man did so when he said, (Prov. xxviii., 13.) "Whoso confesseth and forsaketh his "sin shall have mercy?" or the Psalmist, when he said, (xxxii. 5,) "I will confess my transgression to the Lord, "and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin?"

There may be some so constituted that they can lay hold of a living Christ without feeling the pangs of conscience strongly, simply because they have never been great sinners. But to say that the drunkard, who has desolated homes and ruined souls; the vile, immoral man who has only lived to gratify lust; the murderer, whose

(*a*) Acts viii., 18, 19.

hands have been dyed with blood; the infidel, who has trodden the Son of Man under foot,—to say that such men can be saved without ever being sorry for their sins, and confessing them to God, is to upset the whole plan of salvation, as far as man is concerned, and to open the floodgates of wickedness on the Church itself.

Another dangerous view I would mention is as follows: That it is wrong to address God, the Holy Spirit, in prayer, or to pray for the Holy Spirit. Here are a few extracts from a Tract of the Brethren on the subject. "*If the Spirit be addressed in prayer, or in "Hymns, the rational consequence is almost blasphemy.*" Again, "*If you pray for the Spirit, you virtually deny "that you are Christ's.*" Again, "*the Spirit having been "given, it is mockery to ask God to repeat the gift.*" Again, "*Dear Brethren, prayer for the Spirit is unscriptural.*" (*a*)

Now, this language is not only dangerous and unscriptural, but it is undeniably heretical. If the Holy Ghost is God, as truly as the Father or the Son, and that we are told to pray to God, it is rank heresy to say that we should not pray to the Holy Ghost. If it is "*almost blasphemy*" to pray to the third person in the Trinity, what recipe can the Brethren give us for avoiding this act of blasphemy in our ordinary prayers. When, in praying, I commence with the simple words, "My God; and at the close of prayer say, O, merciful God, grant me these petitions for the sake of Jesus Christ," how can I

(*a*) Pages 6, 7, 8 of a Tract, fully quoted by Mr. John Cox, in his Tract, "The Holy Spirit and Prayer."

avoid the act of "almost blasphemy?" It is true that there are three persons in the Godhead expressed by the word God, but when I use that word I must address the Spirit who forms a part of that Godhead. I can see no way, then, to avoid the act, save by leaving the word "God" out of my prayers altogether.

Now, let me expose this view from Scripture. We are told it is wrong for a Christian to pray for the Spirit. The argument of the Brethren shapes itself thus: "*Every child of God is a temple of the Holy Ghost. He has the Holy Ghost. Therefore, to pray for his influence is a lack of faith, and foolishness—because when he prays thus the Spirit in him prays for the Spirit.*" What saith the Scriptures in reply to this theory? Take, for instance, the 2nd Epistle to the Corinthians. In the opening of that Epistle, St. Paul addresses the members of the church "as sanctified in Christ Jesus," and he thanks God that "in everything they were enriched by Christ, and that "the testimony of Christ was confirmed in them." These words prove that those addressed by the Apostle were Christian people. Well, of course, you remember the prayer with which he closes that Epistle. It has three requests or petitions in it,—"The grace of our Lord "Jesus Christ, and the love of God and the communion "of the Holy Ghost be with you all, Amen." Now, no one, we think, can deny that this is a prayer. It means "May the Triune God give you, my people, more of the grace of Christ, more of the love of God, more of the Spirit's communion;" and if this be so, St. Paul prayed for more of the Spirit for those who were already enriched by Christ.

But there is one general answer to this assertion. There are certain Christian gifts or graces which proceed from the Spirit: love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, (Gal. v., 22.) Now, when St. Paul prays that "the love of the Philippian Christians may abound "more and more" (Phil. i., 9) and that the Christians at Colosse might receive "more wisdom, and spiritual understanding" (Col. i., 9,) and that the Lord might make the Thessalonian Christians, "to increase and abound in love one towards another," (1 Thess., iii., 12,) these are practical prayers not only for more of the Spirit, but to the Spirit. The Brethren may not make such prayers. They may teach that in making them we approach the border-land of blasphemy, but we feel little anxiety about our position. We do what the great Apostle of the Gentiles did. If our prayers are "almost blasphemy," so were his. We stand or fall in this respect with St. Paul.

The Brethren glory in the fact that they have no creed. I have gone to no little trouble through reading their tracts, to compile one for them, and although I know such a compilation will be useless to them as a body, I trust it will be useful to you and others in warning you against them. The creed runs thus:—

I BELIEVE that the Church of God is composed of believers. I BELIEVE that the Brethren constitute

that Church. "I BELIEVE that all professing Christians outside of the Church are connected with Apostacy, Infidelity and Socinianism; that no denomination owns the Spirit of God. I BELIEVE that the moral law is not the rule of christian life. I BELIEVE that the doctrine of Christ's imputed righteousness is nowhere taught in Scripture. I BELIEVE that Christ, during his life, did not really and actually suffer with, or for, his people. I BELIEVE that it is almost blasphemy for a Christian to address the Holy Spirit in prayer, or to pray for the Spirit in any shape or way; and I BELIEVE that Abraham has no place in the Church, nor could any Saint have till the Holy Ghost came at Pentecost." I BELIEVE that the Sabbath was ordained for Jews alone, Christians never had anything to do with it. I BELIEVE that the choosing of Pastors is a daring encroachment on the authority of the Holy Ghost; and finally, I BELIEVE that it is lack of faith for a Christian to pray the Lord's prayer, or in any way to express the thought contained in the words "forgive us our trespasses."

I have endeavored to compile this creed as fairly as I could, for as a rule it is composed of literal quotations from the published works of the Brethren. Here then is the Plymouth creed, and this is what you are asked to believe. You, the members of the Church of England, and indeed the members of all churches, are implored to fly from error, and embrace Christ. Embrace Christ! these are lovely words brethren, in themselves, and yet in this case I would implore you to shrink back from the em-

brace. Embrace Christ through the Plymouth Brethren, and these are the things you must believe. These are the things which lie behind the plain preaching of the Gospel. These are the reserved doctrines which meet you face to face when initiation is over, and practical Plymouth teaching commenced.

As I know by experience that many persons are apt to be drawn into Plymouthism, under the spell of the superior claims to sanctity made by its teachers, and without weighing the consequences of its doctrines, I have found it of use to place in the hands of such persons the following list of questions, to be submitted to the agent of Plymouthism, asking the enquirer at the the same time, to be satisfied with nothing but written answers, and to postpone all action until such answers have been received, and on reception, submitted by the enquirer to his or her clergyman, previous to arriving at a decision. The questions are as follows :—

1. Can I regard my father (or my mother), whom I know to be a life-long Christian member of the ——— Church, as a member of "Christ's Church," in a Plymouth sense ?

2. Could I consistently as a member of the Brethren, now and then, and out of Christian love to my father (or mother), commune with him in his own church ?

3. Could I consistently, as a member of the Brethren, habitually join my family in Family Prayer, my father, or other member of the family, officiating?

4. If allowed to join in Family Prayer, would it be consistent for me to repeat the Lord's Prayer as part of my worship?

5. If my father were dying, and expressed a wish that I should partake of the Holy Communion with him and my family, as a parting act of faith and obedience, could I consistently receive it from the hands of an ordained clergyman of the Church of England, or of any other church?

6. If through sore temptation I fell into one definite sin, would I be justified in confessing that sin in prayer to God, and asking him to forgive me my trespasses?

7. Supposing I feel that I am positively deficient in any one Christian grace or fruit (long-suffering, meekness, temperance), would it be right for me to pray to the Holy Ghost that I might receive the grace?

8. Could I consistently, as a member of the Brethren, subscribe regularly to the funds of any of the great Protestant Churches, for the spread of the Gospel in Heathen lands?

9. Can I consistently, as a member of the Brethren, regard the Ten Commandments as my rule of life?

BIBLIOTHEQUE
SAINT-SULPICE